

### **REMARKS**

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed June 28, 2006. In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 14, 22 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 (first paragraph) and claims 1-24, 26-28 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). This Amendment is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

#### ***Request for Examiner's Interview***

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney if after review, such claims are still not in condition for allowance. This telephone conference would greatly facilitate the examination of the present application. The undersigned attorney can be reached at the telephone number listed below.

#### ***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112***

In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 14, 22 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 (first paragraph), contending that the specification “failed to descript [describe] how the system would determine whether story concept includes content that meets a predetermined criteria set by a party separate from the collaborators.” Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because the specification clearly provides information, implicitly and explicitly, that identifies how the system would determine whether the story concept includes content that meets the predetermined criteria. For instance, as an illustrative embodiment, page 6, lines 7-9 of the specification describes the use of a “rating criteria” for story concepts. As in television and movie programming, a rating criterion could be used. It is clearly evident that a person skilled in the art would be capable of developing rating criteria that could be utilized in accordance with the invention.

Hence, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding §112 rejection.

***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103***

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-24, 26-28 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). More specifically, claims 1-6, 9-10, 14-18, 22-24, 26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dabney (U.S. Patent No. 6,643,663) in view of Hanson (U.S. Patent No. 6,457,045), Fette (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,600) and Lang (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,799). Moreover, claims 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over these four cited references and further in view of Plantz (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,702) and claims 11-13, 19-21, 27 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the four cited references in view Mullins (U.S. Patent No. 5,100,154).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and contend that the Examiner has not met the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See MPEP §2143*. Besides the lack of no or motivation to combine these references, Applicants respectfully contend that no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established because these references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

For instance, with respect to independent claims 1, 14, 22 and 28 include the limitation of deleting content if multiple collaborators have failed to approve the content. Applicants agree with the Examiner that Debney and Hanson fail to teach this limitation. However, Applicants respectfully disagree that either Fette or Lang provides such teaching. In contrast, Fette is directed to the removal of unapproved information based on user approval. Lang teaches a filtering mechanism based on community standards, but such decisions are not based on the multiple collaborators (i.e., the providers of the content) as claimed.

***Conclusion***

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims and respectfully request an Examiner's interview if a timely Notice of Allowance is not scheduled to be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: October 30, 2006

By

  
William W. Schaaf

Reg. No. 39,018

Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025

---

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)**

*I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:*

**MAILING**

**FACSIMILE**

☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service  
as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

☐ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and  
Trademark Office.

Date: October 30, 2006

  
Susan McFarlane

October 30, 2006

Date